2011 Military Health System Conference

Incentivizing the Medical Home

The Quadruple Aim: Working Together, Achieving Success
CAPT Maureen Padden MD MPH FAAFP
25 January 2011







Navy Medicine

maintaining the data needed, and c including suggestions for reducing	lection of information is estimated to completing and reviewing the collect this burden, to Washington Headqu uld be aware that notwithstanding ar DMB control number.	ion of information. Send comments arters Services, Directorate for Infor	regarding this burden estimate mation Operations and Reports	or any other aspect of the 1215 Jefferson Davis	is collection of information, Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington
1. REPORT DATE 25 JAN 2011		2. REPORT TYPE		3. DATES COVE 00-00-2011	red to 00-00-2011
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE				5a. CONTRACT	NUMBER
Incentivizing the M	5b. GRANT NUMBER				
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S)			5d. PROJECT NUMBER		
				5e. TASK NUMBER	
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
	ZATION NAME(S) AND AD RECEIPTION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS AND RECEIPTION NAME(S) AND RECEIPTIO	` '	reet	8. PERFORMING REPORT NUMB	GORGANIZATION ER
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)				10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
				11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAII Approved for publ	LABILITY STATEMENT ic release; distributi	on unlimited			
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NO presented at the 20	otes 11 Military Health	System Conference,	January 24-27, N	National Harl	bor, Maryland
14. ABSTRACT					
15. SUBJECT TERMS					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF	18. NUMBER	19a. NAME OF
a. REPORT unclassified	b. ABSTRACT unclassified	c. THIS PAGE unclassified	Same as Report (SAR)	OF PAGES 16	RESPONSIBLE PERSON

Report Documentation Page

Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188

Outline



- Discuss the Navy PCMH Initiative
- Anticipated effects of well executed PCMH
- Civilian experience with PCMH
- MHS Performance Pilots
- Review of the Pensacola Plan

Navy PMCH Initiative



- Description
 - Small micro-practices of 3-5 providers
 - Standardized staffing model
 - Strategic reinvestment of current resources
 - Use of 4th level MEPRS to delineate teams
- Goal: Demand Management of enrollees
 - Reduce unnecessary visits
 - Leverage asynchronous messaging / team based practice
 - Reduce ER utilization for primary care

Anticipated Effects of PMCH in MHS



- Improved
 - Access to Care
 - Team continuity
 - PCM continuity
 - Patient satisfaction

- Reduced Costs of Care
 - Unnecessary:
 - ER use
 - Network care
 - Ancillary tests
 - Hospitalizations
 - Specialty visits

Potential Impact on Enrollment



Demand
Management
of Enrollees

Reduced
Utilization of
Visits



Increase Enrollment



↓ Utilization + ↓ Unit Cost → ↓ PMPM \$\$\$

Outcomes of Implementing Patient-Centered Medical Home Interventions: A Review of the Evidence From Prospective Evaluation Studies in the United States

Updated November 16, 2010
Kevin Grumbach, MD, Paul Grundy, MD, MPH

- Group Health, Geisenger, VA, Blue Cross Blue Shield, Medicaid (NC, CO) and others...
 - Decreased PMPM
 - Decreased ER utilization
 - Decreased admissions
 - Improved quality metrics
 - Improved customer satisfaction (patients/staff)

The MHS Performance Pilot



- Could replace aspects of PPS if successful
- Components:
 - PCMH Primary Care: Capitation
 - Non PCMH Primary Care: Fee for service
 - Specialty Care: Fee for service
 - Inpatient: Fee for service
 - APV: Fee for service
 - P4P
 - Includes care management fee

Pensacola PMCH Pilot



- 33,795 enrollees in medical homes
- Historical RVU production valued at \$9,105,298 in non capitated environment

But what if we de-incentivized burn and churn and incentivized production of health?

Performance Pilot



- Capitated Funding:
 - \$267.39 per enrollee
 - 33,795 enrollees

\$8,088,030.00

- Care Management
 Fee (level 2 NCQA)
 - \$5.00 per enrollee
 - 33,795 enrollees

\$ 2,027,700.00

Pay For Performance

- Mammography
- Cancer screenings
- Diabetes HEDIS
- Oryx measures
- PCM continuity
- 3rd next available
- Satisfaction ratings
- PMPM Inflation
- ER utilization



Pay For Performance



		Capitation	\$ 8,088,030.00
		Care Mgmt Fee	\$ 2,027,700.00
		Subtotal	\$10,115,730.00
Metric	Baseline*	Goal	Reward
Mammography	80%	1 82%	\$122,122.00
Colorectal	71.6%	† 75%	\$27,971.12
Cervical	83%	1 89%	\$409,718.20
A1C screen	89%	1 95%	\$92,937.40
LDL < 100	44.4%	1 54.4%	\$69,395.00
A1C > 9.0	21%	↓ 18%	\$78,206.20
		Additional P4P	\$800,349.92

Pay For Performance Cont.



Metric	Baseline	Goal	Reward
PCM Continuity	38.8%	60%	\$328,652.16
3 rd next routine	79.2%	86.4%	\$94,842.94
3 rd next acute	55.6%	64.8%	\$383.984.70
Satisfaction – care	92.3%	92.3%	
		Additional P4P	\$807,479.80

*NOTE: rewards are based on increases or decreases from baseline

Pilot Basics



Capitation	\$ 8,088,030.00	
Care Mgmt Fee	\$ 2,027,700.00	
P4P HEDIS	\$800,349.92	
P4P Experience	\$807,479.80	
Subtotal	11,723,559.72	

Doesn't include

- Oryx measures
- ER Utilization
 - Earn or lose based on increase/decrease
- PMPM Costs
 - Earn or lose based on increase/decrease of inflationary costs
- Other areas of care remain in FFS

Risks



PPS Environment: \$9,105,298.00

What if ER use increases?

Capitation	\$ 8,088,030.00	
Care Mgmt Fee	\$ 2,027,700.00	
P4P HEDIS	\$800,349.92	
P4P Experience	\$807,479.80	
Subtotal	11,723,559.72	

? NCQA recognition

What if don't improve?

What if PMPM rises?

Impact on MHS Bottom Line



Demand
Management
of Enrollees

Reduced
Utilization of
Visits

Unused Capacity

Increase Enrollment



↓ Utilization + ↓ Unit Cost → ↓ PMPM \$\$\$

Bottom Line



- Business as usual = high risk!
- Transformation of practice could result in significant reward

"If you don't like change, you're going to like irrelevance even less."

General Eric Shinseki (ret)
Former Chief of Staff, U.S. Army

"Every system is perfectly designed to get the results it produces"

W. Edwards Deming



Questions?